

FORM 7514 (2-76) Prescr. by DAO 214-2	U.S. DEPT. OF COMM.	DATE 4/2/91
TRANSMITTAL SLIP		
TO: Mr. Balazs		REF. NO. OR ROOM, BLDG. F/SWC2
FROM: Phil Williams		REF. NO. OR ROOM, BLDG. F/PR2
ACTION		
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND FILE	<input type="checkbox"/> PER OUR CONVERSATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND RETURN TO ME	<input type="checkbox"/> PER YOUR REQUEST	
<input type="checkbox"/> RETURN WITH MORE DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR APPROVAL	
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND SEE ME ABOUT THIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR INFORMATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE ANSWER	<input type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR COMMENTS	
<input type="checkbox"/> PREPARE REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE	<input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE	
<input type="checkbox"/> TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> INVESTIGATE AND REPORT	

COMMENTS:



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
 1335 East-West Highway
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 THE DIRECTOR

1991
 APR 02 1991
 NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
 APR 11 10 02 PM '91

HONOLULU LABORATORY

Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
 United States Senate
 Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you for your letter regarding the status of the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has not scrapped the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan. In fact, it is being implemented. Our recovery actions range from the identification and protection of nesting beaches through enforcement and educational efforts, to assessments of the incidental take of sea turtles by commercial fisheries. We are also using the interagency consultation requirements of the Endangered Species Act to protect sea turtle habitat from the adverse effects of coastal development.

Scientists at our Honolulu Laboratory have been conducting sea turtle research and monitoring the status of populations. This year they received \$50,000 in supplemental funding to conduct additional research on the green turtle, including surveys to delineate their foraging habitat in the main Hawaiian Islands. In addition, NMFS sponsored a workshop in December on the etiology of fibropapillomas in the green turtle. The results of that workshop were just published, and I anticipate that our scientists will develop proposals to fund the research needs identified in the workshop.

I have not approved the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan because it is being revised and incorporated into a broader Pacific Basin Plan. The need for expanding the range of our recovery efforts is based on the widespread pelagic occurrence of these species, and the need for coordinated research and management by all countries and territories in the region. I expect to have a completed Pacific Basin Sea Turtle Recovery Plan in place by the end of FY 1993, but be assured we are fully committed to the implementation of recovery efforts for Hawaii's sea turtles while this plan being developed.

I appreciate your interest in our efforts to protect sea turtles.

Sincerely,

131

William W. Fox, Jr.

F/UC(2), F/PR-Foster, GCF-Gleaves, LA11-F(2)-Weaver, F/PC, F/PR2-Karnella, Williams, F/SWR-Fullerton, Lecky, w/incoming SWC-Barrett, Eckert, w/incoming, F/SWC2-Boehlert, Balazs, incoming



United States Senate

SUITE 722, HART SENATE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1102
(202) 224-3934
FAX (202) 224-8747

March 13, 1991

Mr. William W. Fox, Jr.
Assistant Administrator for Fisheries
National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA
1335 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Mr. Fox:

I wish to share with you a letter from my constituent, Ms. Susan Scott, regarding the status of the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan.


I share the concerns raised in Ms. Scott's letter and article. I am disappointed that the much needed relief for Hawaiian sea turtles is taking so long. I am especially concerned about the dramatic increase in the number of turtles afflicted with tumors. I understand that the tumor problem is one of the research priorities identified in NOAA's draft turtle recovery plan.

After NOAA led the public into believing that the draft recovery plan would be approved "shortly," I understand that NOAA has decided to scrap the draft recovery plan.

I would appreciate your comments on the status of NOAA's efforts to prepare a Hawaiian sea turtle recovery plan, when we can expect the plan to be approved, and NOAA's plans for funding the recovery plan.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter.

Aloha


DANIEL K. INOUE
United States Senator

DKI:mck
Enclosure

Susan Scott

P.O. Box 8659 • Honolulu, HI 96830 • (808) 946-3881 or (808) 637-9843

612387
Rec'd 1/22/90
JNOU
91 JAN 15 AM 10:46

January 13, 1991

Senator Daniel Inouye
Prince Kuhio Federal Building
300 Ala Moana
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Senator Inouye:

Enclosed is a column I wrote for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin about problems with the federal recovery plan for Hawaii's sea turtles. Would you please look into this and tell me if the plan is now approved? If so, why do we have to wait several more years for funds?

Our turtles need help now. These gentle creatures are plagued with tumors that cover eyes and limbs and eventually kill. I see this disease on the turtles more often now and my readers frequently write me about it.

Please help us boost the turtle recovery plan into action while we still have turtles.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Susan Scott

Susan Scott

Bureaucratic net hinders help for Hawaii sea turtle

I recently received a letter from a reader asking about the federal Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan. Here is part of that letter:

"A long, long time ago I remember that you wrote a nice column about sea turtles, what people can do to help them, and also how the government has been scandalously slow in completing and approving a recovery plan for these beloved animals.

"Well, those fat-cat bureaucrats are still at it, so I've heard. I called the other day to get a copy of the plan to see what they're doing and was told, 'It still ain't done.' Can you imagine that? I thought you wrote that column over a year ago.

"Over here in Kaneohe Bay, we have so many turtles sick with growths that if they wait another year, I'm sure they'll all be dead. What are they waiting for — the turtles to go extinct?"

This letter is not signed but the return address says: "Sea Turtle Lovers Association of Hawaii."

I doubt that this organization has meetings or collects dues, but I know its membership is large. Who doesn't love these gentle creatures?

I checked the date on the column mentioned above and it is, indeed, ancient history: June 19, 1989. Then I called the Honolulu office of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and confirmed that our sea turtle recovery plan still has not been approved by the Washington, D.C., office.

This surprises me. I have year-old letters from Pat Saiki, Daniel Akaka and Daniel Inouye all saying that they had looked into this and taken care of it. Apparently, the plan fizzled sometime later.

I've spent hours on the phone trying to get answers to this hold-up and the best explanation I can get is this: Hawaii's Sea Turtle Recovery Plan is caught in a bureaucratic waterspout. It has been swirling from desk to desk getting rejected, revised and rewritten.

The problem, as I understand it, is that Hawaii's turtle workers have been coming up with some answers but people in Washington keep changing the questions.

However, the latest word from Jim Lecky, chief of the Protective Species Management Division of the Southwest Region of NMFS (Los Angeles) is this: The turtle recovery plan should meet Washington's approval next month. By 1992 or '93, Hawaii workers should have more money to help our turtles recover their numbers.

And that, of course, is what this



OCEAN WATCH

By Susan Scott

11/5/90

is all about — money. An accepted recovery plan will increase federal spending on turtles. Sure, this isn't the best time in the world to be begging money from the federal government. But if they can afford \$500,000 for a museum in memory of Lawrence Welk, can't they also afford the same to save Hawaii's turtles?

Given the present turtle tumor disease, we might soon be building museums in memory of sea turtles. But Lecky assures me that the tumor problem has high priority regardless of what happens to the recovery plan. Scientists are meeting in Honolulu early next year to share their findings and to offer suggestions.

I believe that this meeting will happen and that the recovery plan will eventually become a reality. But there are a few things concerned citizens can do while waiting for one committee to form another to study the problem. Here are some ideas:

■ Send this column and a letter to the winners of tomorrow's elections asking why we have to wait until '92 or '93 to get turtle money when the recovery plan was completed in 1987. (The East Coast turtle plan was approved in 1984.)

These legislators have all been claiming to be active environmentalists. So let's see some action.

■ Don't harass sea turtles by trying to swim with them. Spread the word that this is not only illegal but hurts these wild animals, perhaps spooking them in a way that hinders their reproductive efforts.

■ Public education has high priority in the turtle recovery plan, and kids adore turtles. Look at the Teen-age Mutants. So, let's urge the owner of Paradise Park to build giant replicas of Hawaiian sea turtles instead of dinosaurs.

This isn't so silly. Sea turtles are one of the few intact survivors of the Age of Reptiles, the dinosaur era. If dinosaur exhibits are so popular, why not make those in Hawaii reflect Hawaii's "dinosaurs?"

Susan Scott is a marine science writer and author of *Oceanwatcher*, a guide to Hawaii's marine animals. Her *Oceanwatch* column appears Monday in the *Star-Bulletin*.

FORM CD-14 (2-76) Prescr. by DAO 214-2		U.S. DEPT. OF COMM.	DATE APR 17 1991
TRANSMITTAL SLIP			
TO: GHB		REF. NO. OR ROOM, BLDG.	
FROM: GWB		REF. NO. OR ROOM, BLDG.	
ACTION			
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND FILE	<input type="checkbox"/> PER OUR CONVERSATION		
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND RETURN TO ME	<input type="checkbox"/> PER YOUR REQUEST		
<input type="checkbox"/> RETURN WITH MORE DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR APPROVAL		
<input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND SEE ME ABOUT THIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR INFORMATION		
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE ANSWER	<input type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR COMMENTS		
<input type="checkbox"/> PREPARE REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE	<input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE		
<input type="checkbox"/> TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> INVESTIGATE AND REPORT		

COMMENTS:

*hold on, Geo, you
ain't seen nothing yet!*



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Southwest Fisheries Center Honolulu Laboratory
2570 Dole St. • Honolulu, Hawaii 96822-2396

15 April 1991

F/SWC2:GWB

MEMORANDUM FOR: F/PR - Phil Williams
THROUGH: F/SWC - Izadore Barrett
FROM: F/SWC2 - George Boehlert
SUBJECT: SWFSC Bimonthly Report

I am writing in response to your e-mail to George Balazs, who is on annual leave for the next week or so. I am familiar with the text you cite, because I approved it in a press release and in the bimonthly format. To the best of our knowledge at the time, it reflected the current situation. I believe that your rather widely copied e-mail contains some inaccuracies that are best cleared up rather than allowed to fester and perhaps get blown out of proportion.

First, a few comments on the text of the Bimonthly Report:

The tumor disease was designated the number one research priority in the draft Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan. I think that there is little controversy here. This plan has had its ups and downs, but on 29 August 1989 was made available for public comment and the draft is thus a part of the public record. I fail to see how this statement misrepresents any facts. I personally attended the entire fibropapilloma workshop and actively participated. I am sincerely convinced that the tumor problem is a severe problem requiring significant scientific attention.

The plan is still under review by officials of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in Washington, D.C. This statement seems to be the crucial issue. I would like to show how the statement was accurate given the facts at hand. The 13 December 1989 memo from Foster to Fullerton provided F/PR's comments on Hawaiian plan more than two months after the deadline for public comment. It was revised accordingly and resubmitted to Regional Director Fullerton on 13 April 1990; he disapproved the plan on 10 May, citing further work needed and recommended a conference call to iron out details. In the subsequent 16 May conference call, Jim Lecky informed Balazs, Nitta, and Wetherall that the recovery definition would be acceptable if "carrying capacity" was removed. Eugene Nitta was assigned responsibility for a rewrite before submission to F/PR.



The 11 June memo from Fox to Foster (not received at the Honolulu Laboratory or by any Recovery Team members until 26 July) called for single plan for the Pacific, integrating the Hawaii plan. On 9 August, a memo from Fullerton to Fox recommended approving the Hawaii Recovery Plan and formulating a mechanism to develop plans for other parts of the Pacific; it also promised to submit a formal plan to Foster in September and to appoint a team coordinator (according to Jim Lecky on 28 September, submission of this plan was unnecessary because no response to Fullerton's memo was received). On 28 October (after meeting with you) Jim Lecky informed me that the Hawaii plan would be approved as an "interim plan." While unsure of the exact meaning of this term, I dutifully informed the local team members. On 29 October, George Balazs received a phone call from Susan Scott for information on the status of the recovery plan, following up on an article she had written a year earlier; because of uncertainty about the meaning of "interim," he referred her to Jim Lecky; he did not "stir her up." Jim was quoted in the 5 November newspaper article by Scott as saying that approval of the recovery plan would occur in the next month. To the best of our knowledge, this was the official NMFS position and nothing was communicated to us to the contrary.

On 4-6 December, the Marine Turtle Fibropapilloma Disease Workshop was held in Honolulu. On 17 December, we issued a press release on the tumor workshop, which was modified only slightly from the bimonthly report format. Those statements were accurate at that time, because we did not learn of the apparently new NMFS position until 26 December, when we first received a copy of the 14 December letter from Dr. Fox to Senator Akaka. Contrary to your e-mail, however, we did not "stir up" Congressional delegations. This has been done by the media with information available to the general public; I can assure you that no "inside" information was provided by the Honolulu Laboratory. On 11 April I received a copy of the 2 April letter from Dr. Fox to Senator Inouye. This is a much more temperate letter than that to Senator Akaka and will probably not stir up a response as the first one did.

Phil, from the above rather tortuous chronology of the events leading to the offending text, you must admit that communication flow about the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan from Washington to this remote outpost of the National Marine Fisheries Service has been less than adequate. We believe that the issues identified in the plan are important, and lacking timely feedback on the science, content, or format, we must assume that others do as well. Your reference to the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan as a "dead horse" is probably an apt, if unfortunate, metaphor. The Recovery Team has been riding that horse in good faith for several years, but only recently did they learn that the lack of forward movement was related to an early and untimely death of their steed.

I agree that it is time to put this matter behind us. In my experience, the best solution to an internecine squabble tends to be clear and frequent communication. Balazs told me a few months back that you have **not once** contacted him by phone. We do have a fax machine here (808-943-1248), voice phone (Balazs-808-943-1240, Boehlert FTS 551-3614). As a first, small step, I will ask George to call you upon his return from annual leave and open the necessary lines of communication.

cc: Nancy Foster
Charles Karnella
James Lecky

Date: 4-11-91 1:06pm
From: PHIL WILLIAMS:nmfs:noaa
To: GeorgeBalazs:Honolulu:NMFS
cc: Nancy Foster, Charles Karnella, Izadore Barrett,
GeorgeBoehlert:Honolulu:NMFS, PHIL WILLIAMS
Subj: SWFC Newsletter-Report of Activities (Nov-Dec 1990)

-I just finished reading your article on the workshop on marine tumor disease. In it, you make the statement that tumor disease is the number one research priority in the draft Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan, followed by the statement that the plan is still under review by officials of NMFS in Washington, D.C. The not-so-subtle conclusion left to the reader is that Washington is preventing you from carrying on this priority research.

I find it unfortunate that you see fit to try to continue a public fight over the Hawaiian sea turtle recovery plan. Talk about beating a dead horse! Don't you have enough real work to do then to spend your time stirring up the Susan Scotts and Congressional delegations in your region with such misrepresentations of the facts?

If you could find it in yourself to put this behind you, I think that you would find that there is substantial support for sea turtle recovery efforts in Washington. The choice is yours.

cc: Jim Lecky, F/SWR



W66
GHB
SGF
DO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Southwest Fisheries Center Honolulu Laboratory
2570 Dole St. • Honolulu, Hawaii 96822-2396

April 17, 1991

F/SWC2:GWB

MEMORANDUM FOR: F/PR - Nancy Foster
FROM: F/SWC2 - George Boehlert *George Boehlert*
SUBJECT: E-mail, Innuendo, and Character Assassination

The time has come to leash the F/PR attack dog. Staff at the Honolulu Laboratory, myself included, are being impugned with innuendo and accused of everything from malfeasance to illicit (if not illegal) congressional and press contacts by Phil Williams and his intemperate, vicious e-mails. I have responded to the first e-mail (attachment 1) with a memo through Izadore Barrett to Phil that he (and you, by cc:) have probably not yet received (attachment 2). I will not elaborate on attachment 1, but rather let attachment 2 speak for me. The only exception is that I formally withdraw my offer to have George Balazs call Phil to try and patch things up. Phil's continuing vendetta has pushed things beyond the point where simple words will help.

The most recent e-mail, of which you may be aware, was sent to Jim Lecky and Scott Eckert and copied to Charles Karnella, on 16 April; it is provided as attachment 3. It deals with answers to enquiries on the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan from Hawaii Senator Inouye and makes several accusations. I address the most egregious points below.

1. The Honolulu Laboratory "brethren ... started this ball rolling."

Part of this is addressed in attachment 2. I should point out that the first congressional contact on this matter, from a Mr. Merriman of Congresswoman Mink's office, was referred to me by Phil Williams. The questions posed by Senator Inouye would seem to be a logical outcome of the letter sent him on 2 April. I further think that you should examine closely the red flags in the letter Phil drafted to Senator Akaka, sent by Dr. Fox on 14 December 1990; we are often requested to comment on letters sent to members of the Hawaii delegation, but certainly were not on this one. It is probably rather naive to think that the staff of the Senators from Hawaii do not communicate with one another. I request that Phil produce evidence that any Honolulu Laboratory staff played any direct role in these developments.

2. FY 1991 expenditures, personnel: Balazs: "congressional and media relations," Boehlert, 5%, "holding Balazs' hand, congressional and media relations."



For heavens sake! Is it acceptable behavior at headquarters to publish scurrilous comments about NMFS research scientists and Laboratory directors? Is it unreasonable for me to expect either evidence confirming these accusations or a formal apology? The hand-holding accusation is slanderous. As far as our policy on media and congressional relations, we initiate contacts to the media only through press releases and initiate no contacts to congressional staff other than the content of press releases they may see. We do, however, receive occasional calls from both. It has been my policy here that staff make available factual information when queried by the press, and to inform me of all such queries. On congressional contacts, they are welcome to provide materials already available in the public record, but are asked to refer queries to me or to Legislative Affairs when the matters are deemed sensitive. We routinely file congressional contact forms and "media alerts." I believe this falls within policy.

3. "The recovery team ... was unwilling to revise the plan, and so we have taken on this responsibility."

Nancy, let's examine this one. If this statement goes into the testimony, I will feel compelled to examine the issue closely and to learn more of the details myself. May we see F/PR's or Phil's formal comments on the plan? May we examine the timeliness of F/PR's comments relative to receipt of the plan? May we examine the anonymous comments of your outside reviewers? I frankly think that your office's procedures relating to processing the Hawaii Sea Turtle Recovery Plan would not fare well under such scrutiny.

Those of us covered by PMRS have been asked to modify our performance plans as mandated in the memorandum from John Innocenti dated 31 October 1990. Is Phil's treatment of all aspects of the Hawaii Sea Turtle Recovery Plan truly "Cooperation and Teamwork"? Certainly the actions of the past week are less than that.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you at your earliest convenience. As you can see from the above, I have no problem defending the actions and performance of my staff. In light of Phil's intemperance and lack of professionalism, can you in good conscience say the same?

Attachments

cc: I. Barrett

ATTACHMENT 1

Date: 4-11-91 1:06pm
From: PHIL WILLIAMS:nmfs:noaa
To: GeorgeBalazs:Honolulu:NMFS
cc: Nancy Foster, Charles Karnella, Izadore Barrett,
GeorgeBoehlert:Honolulu:NMFS, PHIL WILLIAMS
Subj: SWFC Newsletter-Report of Activities (Nov-Dec 1990)

-I just finished reading your article on the workshop on marine tumor disease. In it, you make the statement that tumor disease is the number one research priority in the draft Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan, followed by the statement that the plan is still under review by officials of NMFS in Washington, D.C. The not-so-subtle conclusion left to the reader is that Washington is preventing you from carrying on this priority research.

I find it unfortunate that you see fit to try to continue a public fight over the Hawaiian sea turtle recovery plan. Talk about beating a dead horse! Don't you have enough real work to do than to spend your time stirring up the Susan Scotts and Congressional delegations in your region with such misrepresentations of the facts?

If you could find it in yourself to put this behind you, I think that you would find that there is substantial support for sea turtle recovery efforts in Washington. The choice is yours.

cc: Jim Lecky, F/SWR

ATTACHMENT 2

17 April 1991

F/SWC2:GWB

MEMORANDUM FOR: F/PR - Phil Williams
THROUGH: F/SWC - Izadore Barrett
FROM: F/SWC2 - George Boehlert
SUBJECT: SWFSC Bimonthly Report

I am writing in response to your e-mail to George Balazs, who is on annual leave for the next week or so. I am familiar with the text you cite, because I approved it in a press release and in the bimonthly format. To the best of our knowledge at the time, it reflected the current situation. I believe that your rather widely copied e-mail contains some inaccuracies that are best cleared up rather than allowed to fester and perhaps get blown out of proportion.

First, a few comments on the text of the Bimonthly Report:

The tumor disease was designated the number one research priority in the draft Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan. I think that there is little controversy here. This plan has had its ups and downs, but on 29 August 1989 was made available for public comment and the draft is thus a part of the public record. I fail to see how this statement misrepresents any facts. I personally attended the entire fibropapilloma workshop and actively participated. I am sincerely convinced that the tumor problem is a severe problem requiring significant scientific attention.

The plan is still under review by officials of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in Washington, D.C. This statement seems to be the crucial issue. I would like to show how the statement was accurate given the facts at hand. The 13 December 1989 memo from Foster to Fullerton provided F/PR's comments on Hawaiian plan more than two months after the deadline for public comment. It was revised accordingly and resubmitted to Regional Director Fullerton on 13 April 1990; he disapproved the plan on 10 May, citing further work needed and recommended a conference call to iron out details. In the subsequent 16 May conference call, Jim Lecky informed Balazs, Nitta, and Wetherall that the recovery definition would be acceptable if "carrying capacity" was removed. Eugene Nitta was assigned responsibility for a rewrite before submission to F/PR.

The 11 June memo from Fox to Foster (not received at the Honolulu Laboratory or by any Recovery Team members until 26 July) called for single plan for the Pacific, integrating the Hawaii plan. On 9 August, a memo from Fullerton to Fox recommended approving the Hawaii Recovery Plan and formulating a mechanism to develop plans for other parts of the Pacific; it also promised to submit a formal plan to Foster in September and to appoint a team coordinator (according to Jim Lecky on 28 September, submission of this plan was unnecessary because no response to Fullerton's memo was received). On 28 October (after meeting with you) Jim Lecky informed me that the Hawaii plan would be approved as an "interim plan." While unsure of the exact meaning of this term, I dutifully informed the local team members. On 29 October, George Balazs received a phone call from Susan Scott for information on the status of the recovery plan, following up on an article she had written a year earlier; because of uncertainty about the meaning of "interim," he referred her to Jim Lecky; he did not "stir her up." Jim was quoted in the 5 November newspaper article by Scott as saying that approval of the recovery plan would occur in the next month. To the best of our knowledge, this was the official NMFS position and nothing was communicated to us to the contrary.

On 4-6 December, the Marine Turtle Fibropapilloma Disease Workshop was held in Honolulu. On 17 December, we issued a press release on the tumor workshop, which was modified only slightly from the bimonthly report format. Those statements were accurate at that time, because we did not learn of the apparently new NMFS position until 26 December, when we first received a copy of the 14 December letter from Dr. Fox to Senator Akaka. Contrary to your e-mail, however, we did not "stir up" Congressional delegations. This has been done by the media with information available to the general public; I can assure you that no "inside" information was provided by the Honolulu Laboratory. On 11 April I received a copy of the 2 April letter from Dr. Fox to Senator Inouye. This is a much more temperate letter than that to Senator Akaka and will probably not stir up a response as the first one did.

Phil, from the above rather tortuous chronology of the events leading to the offending text, you must admit that communication flow about the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan from Washington to this remote outpost of the National Marine Fisheries Service has been less than adequate. We believe that the issues identified in the plan are important, and lacking timely feedback on the science, content, or format, we must assume that others do as well. Your reference to the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan as a "dead horse" is probably an apt, if unfortunate, metaphor. The Recovery Team has been riding that horse in good faith for several years, but only recently did they learn that the lack of forward movement was related to an early and untimely death of their steed.

I agree that it is time to put this matter behind us. In my experience, the best solution to an internecine squabble tends to be clear and frequent communication. Balazs told me a few months back that you have **not once** contacted him by phone. We do have a fax machine here (808-943-1248), voice phone (Balazs-808-943-1240, Boehlert FTS 551-3614). As a first, small step, I will ask George to call you upon his return from annual leave and open the necessary lines of communication.

cc: Nancy Foster
Charles Karnella
James Lecky

ATTACHMENT 3

Date: 4-16-91 2:44pm
From: PHIL WILLIAMS:nmfs:noaa
To: Jim Lecky:F_{SWR}_T_I:NOAA, Scott Eckert:LaJolla:NMFS
cc: Charles Karnella, PHIL WILLIAMS
Subj: Hawaiian Sea Turtle Budget Drill

We have been provided the following question(s) by Senator Inouye to be answered at the Senate Appropriations Committee FY 1992 Budget Hearing. I've come up with an immediate short answer and an outline of something more detailed. I'll work on getting more details, but need your help for some facts and to review the responses for accuracy (add or delete what you think necessary).

Under other circumstances I would ask you and those directly involved for help. But, since it was our Honolulu Lab brethren who started this ball rolling, I'll leave it to your diplomatic inquiries to gather any other facts necessary.

We need to submit this by Thursday PM (18th) to the Budget and Planning Office, so once again a short project fuse!! Thanks for your help.

ROUGH DRAFT RESPONSE TO INOUE QUESTIONS:

Question 1. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) recently informed me that, without approving a final plan, NMFS is implementing portions of the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan.

How much funding has NMFS allocated to Hawaiian Sea Turtle recovery actions in FY 1991?

Response Base funding for center and region personnel, current research budget, and \$50K add-on.

Personnel:

Region (Nitta) xx % of time on section 7 consultations, etc.

Lecky 10% section 7, region-HQ relations

Center (Balazs) 100% monitoring, research, congressional and media relations

Boehlert 5% holding Balazs' hand, congressional and media relations

Wetherall 5% driftnet research 7

Other researchers?

Activities: total budget FY91 = \$150K (from draft Hawaiian Plan)

census and tagging	\$25K
document incidental take	\$15K
evaluate permitted research	staff time
stranding network	\$15K
information and education	\$15K
fibropapillomas (from F/SWR)	\$50K?
maintain natural habitats (7)	\$15K
population modeling	\$ 5K?
report incidental take	\$15K

Question 2 Which recovery actions will this fund in FY 1991?

Response X Staff persons +

population censusing and tagging, documentation of incidental take, evaluation of permitted research, maintenance of sea turtle stranding network, information dissemination and educational activities, workshop on green turtle fibropapillomas, maintenance of natural habitats through the section 7 ESA consultation process, population modeling, reporting and documentation of incidental take.

Question 3 How much funding does NMFS propose to allocate to Hawaiian sea turtle recovery in FY 1992?

Response Senator, I'm glad you asked me that question... Unable to determine at this time. However, priority recovery actions would be to monitor and assess stocks, determine their habitat and requirements, and to investigate the turtle tumor disease.

Question 4 How much of this funding will go toward Hawaiian sea turtle tumor research?

Unable to determine at this time. It will be ranked for funding with other recovery actions funded by NMFS nationwide. Tumor research is ongoing in SE US (Jacobson) and we are monitoring the disease in research in Hawaii and the West coast (San Diego). In terms of recovery priorities this ranks as the top research priority, but we must also consider more basic information gathering on the status of these stocks and their habitat requirements, and implementing recovery actions which will directly

affect sea turtles, in addition to research and monitoring of tumors in green turtles.

The recent NMFS-sponsored workshop on green turtle tumors identified several research initiatives for total funding of \$XXX. We will be seeking funding for many of these initiatives both within the agency and with other agencies and organizations concerned about sea turtle protection.

Question 5 If NMFS is already implementing portions of the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan, what is the justification for delaying final approval of the plan, and for incorporating this plan into a broader Pacific Basin plan?

Response I have not yet approved this recovery plan because it does not provide an adequate discussion and justification of the measures needed to be taken by NMFS and other agencies to recover these species.

A recovery plan is a public document available to all that must provide a clear discussion of the problems facing endangered and threatened species, the sources of these problems, a description of needed actions to recover these species, and a ranking and estimate of cost of those actions, and clear criteria to measure recovery. Quite simply, the current draft plan does not do this.

The draft plan does list recovery actions many of which NMFS has accepted and is undertaking, often with the cooperation of other agencies such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Our recovery actions range from the identification and protection of nesting beaches through enforcement and educational efforts, to assessments of the incidental take of sea turtles by commercial fisheries. We are also using the interagency consultation requirements of the Endangered Species Act to protect sea turtle habitat from the adverse effects of coastal development.

Scientists at our Honolulu Laboratory have been conducting sea turtle research and monitoring the status of populations and additional research on the green turtle, including surveys to delineate their foraging habitat in the main Hawaiian Islands. In addition, NMFS sponsored a workshop in December on the etiology of fibropapillomas to the green turtle.

The recovery team, which advised NMFS and drafted the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Recovery Plan, was unwilling to revise the plan, and so we have taken on this responsibility. The Plan will be incorporated into a

broader Pacific Basin Plan. The need for expanding the range of our recovery efforts is based on the widespread pelagic occurrence of these species (MOPS cruises, tuna observers, Driftnet monitoring), and the need for coordinated research and management by all Pacific Basin countries and territories.